UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,394	12/22/2004	Christoph Siegelin	76.0733/PR	2863

41754   7590   07/09/2008

THE JANSSON FIRM
9501 N. CAPITAL OF TX HWY #202
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER
CHRZANOWSKI, MATTHEW R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2186	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 February 2008 and 31 March 2008*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *31 March 2008* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   **Claims 1-2, 11, 13, 23, 32-35, 38-39** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by **Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter "Ban")**.

Consider **claims 1 and 13**, Ban discloses a method to write in flash type

memory *(flash memory, abstract; method (i.e., software, or firmware of*

hardware)…, page 2, lines 7-10) of an electronic module comprising:

defining a mirror area *(block, areas, units, or zones: page 2, line 21-page*

3, line 15, page 3, lines 1-2) divided in at least two physical areas of said

memory *(flash memory physical address locations, page 2, line 21)*

designed to contain a same logical area for storing a content *(fixed-length*

group of physical byte addresses form a logical block, page 3, lines 1-2;

one or more physically contiguous flash memory areas or zones comprise

a number of blocks, page 3, lines 4-7; therefore the physical byte

addresses are associated with logical blocks, zones and units, FIG. 2, 3, &

7; Furthermore, there are a plurality of unique Logical areas associated

with a fixed-length group of physical byte addresses: FIG. 3, 4, 7 and page

2, line 21-page 3, line 15);

designating one of the physical areas as being an active physical area;

and during a write *(abstract)* to said logical area, programming the content

of said logical area into the active area *(flash memory system which*

"allows data to be continuously written to unwritten physical address

locations," abstract; data cannot be written to an area of flash memory in

which data has previously been written, unless the area is first erased, so

the area is blank when programming page 1, lines 26-29) (page 7, lines 1

- page 9, line 22 and page 13, claim 1).

Consider **claims 2 and 23**, and as applied to **claims 1 and 13** above, Ban

discloses the method further comprising erasing the content of all mirror memory

areas used in a single operation at a convenient time *("One or more physically*

contiguous flash memory areas (called zones) that can be physically erased

using suitable prior art flash memory technology comprise a unit and each unit

contains an integral number of blocks," page 3, lines 4-7; there is a zone erase

operation that erases the unit that includes that block, and unit containing the

logical block consisting of multiple physical address locations are therefore all

erased, the page 3, lines 24-25) (page 7, lines 1 - page 9, line 22 and page 13,

claim 1).

Consider **claim 11**, Ban discloses an electronic module having information

processing means *(the device writes and stores data, abstract)* and comprising a

flash type non volatile memory *(flash memory, abstract)* having a mirror memory

formed from at least two physical areas *(flash memory physical address*

locations, page 2, line 21) designed to contain a same logical area *(fixed-length*

group of physical byte addresses form a logical block, page 3, lines 1-2; one or

more physically contiguous flash memory areas or zones comprise a number of

blocks, page 3, lines 4-7; therefore the physical byte addresses are associated

with logical blocks, zones and units, FIG. 2, 3, & 7; Furthermore, there are a

plurality of unique Logical areas associated with a fixed-length group of physical

byte addresses: FIG. 3, 4, 7 and page 2, line 21-page 3, line 15), each new

programming operation in said logical area taking place in one of the physical

areas of the mirror memory *(flash memory system which "allows data to be*

continuously written to unwritten physical address locations," abstract; data

cannot be written to an area of flash memory in which data has previously been

written, unless the area is first erased, so the area is blank when programming

page 1, lines 26-29) (page 7, lines 1 - page 9, line 22 and page 13, claim 1).

Consider **claim 32 and 38**, and as applied to **claim 1 and 13** above, Ban

discloses the method wherein each physical area has a status which is one of

three statuses *(each block denotes its status: page 7, lines 11-14; each block*

maps to physical address, therefore each physical area has a status: FIG. 4):

blank *(block free and writable: page 7, line 13)*, active *(block allocates and*

contains user data: page 7, line 13-14) and used *(block deleted and not writable:*

page 7, line 13).

Consider **claim 33 and 39**, and as applied to **claim 32 and 38** above, Ban

discloses the method wherein:

the blank status corresponds to one of the physical areas ready to receive

data but not selected for receiving data *(block free and writable: page 7,*

line 13),

the active status corresponds to one of the physical areas ready to receive

data and selected for receiving data or to one of the physical areas

containing the actual content of the logical area to be read *(block allocates*

and contains user data: page 7, line 13),

the used status corresponds to one of the physical areas containing

an outdated data that shall not be read, said physical area waiting for an

erasure *(block deleted and not writable: page 7, line 13)*.

Consider **claim 34**, and as applied to **claim 11** above, Ban discloses the

method wherein each physical area has a status which is one of three statuses

(each block denotes its status: page 7, lines 11-14; each block maps to physical

address, therefore each physical area has a status: FIG. 4): blank *(block free and writable: page 7, line 13)*, active *(block allocates and contains user data: page 7, line 13-14)* and used *(block deleted and not writable: page 7, line 13)*.

Consider **claim 35**, and as applied to **claim 34** above, Ban discloses the method wherein:

the blank status corresponds to one of the physical areas ready to receive data but not selected for receiving data *(block free and writable: page 7, line 13)*,

the active status corresponds to one of the physical areas ready to receive data and selected for receiving data or to one of the physical areas containing the actual content of the logical area to be read *(block allocates and contains user data: page 7, line 13)*,

the used status corresponds to one of the physical areas containing an outdated data that shall not be read, said physical area waiting for an erasure *(block deleted and not writable: page 7, line 13)*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

  1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
        obviousness or nonobviousness.

5.   **Claims 3, 7-8, 18, 24, and 28-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter "Ban")** as applied to **claims 1-2, 13,**

and 23 above, and further in view of **Assar et al. (WO 95/10083 hereinafter "Assar").**

        Consider **claims 3 and 24**, and as applied to **claims 2 and 23** above, Ban

discloses the method wherein there is a convenient time as described above in

claim 2 and 23.

        However, Ban does not disclose the method comprising performing the

erasure during a period of inactivity or when all the physical areas are used.

        Assar discloses a method comprising performing an erasure when all the

physical areas are used *(when physical memory is filled, blocks with certain flags*

set are erased, wherein as described above blocks contain multiple physical

mirror areas, page 20, lines 10-19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform an erasure when all the physical areas are used in the system of Ban, because Assar teaches it is necessary to erase some data when a memory is full in order to place new data in a flash memory *(page 20, lines 10-19)*.

Consider **claims 7 and 28**, and as applied to **claims 1 and 13** above, Ban discloses the method comprising designating said active physical areas *(active unit made up of active blocks, FIG. 7; page 9, lines 27-30; page 10, line 1)*.

However, Ban does not disclose the method comprising designating said active physical areas using a counter and incrementing the counter on each change of active area.

Assar discloses a method comprising designating active physical areas using a counter *(counter 620 page 18, lines26-page 19, line 1; page 20, line 17 and 26; counter 620 is used in conjunction with flags such as the used/free flag 112)* and incrementing the counter on each change of active area *(page 20, lines 10-19)*.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to designate active physical areas using a counter in the system of Ban, because Assar teaches a counter is used to show the number of times a block has been erased and written (which areas are most

and least worn out) in order to determine where to write next *(page 18, lines 26-28; abstract)*.

Consider **claims 8 and 29**, and as applied to **claims 1 and 13** above, Ban discloses the method of claims 1 and 13.

However, Ban does not disclose the method comprising associating at least one bit with a logical area to represent the use state of at least one physical area of said logical area.

Assar discloses a method comprising associating at least one bit *(one bit used flag 626, page 18, line 36)* with a logical area *(data block, page 18, lines 31-37)* to represent the use state of at least one physical area of said logical area *(page 18, lines 35-37)*.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate at least one bit with a logical area to represent the use state of at least one physical area of said logical area in the system of Ban, because Assar teaches used/free flag is used to avoid an erase-before-write cycle and therefore avoid the overhead of an erase cycle *(page 7, lines 9-21)*.

Consider **claim 18**, and as applied to **claim 7** above, Ban in view of Assar discloses the method of claim 7.

However, Ban does not disclose the method comprising associating at least one bit with a logical area representing the use state of at least one physical area of said logical area.

Assar discloses a method comprising associating at least one bit *(one bit used flag 626, page 18, line 36)* with a logical area *(data block, page 18, lines 31-37)* representing the use state of at least one physical area of said logical area *(page 18, lines 35-37)*.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to associate at least one bit with a logical area representing the use state of at least one physical area of said logical area in the system of Ban, because Assar teaches used/free flag is used to avoid an erase-before-write cycle and therefore avoid the overhead of an erase cycle *(page 7, lines 9-21)*.

6.   **Claims 4 and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter "Ban")** as applied to **claims 1 and 13** above, and further in view of **Mennecart (WO 01/88926 A1 hereinafter "Mennecart").**

Consider **claims 4 and 25**, and as applied to **claims 1 and 13** above, Ban discloses the method of claims 1 and 13.

However Ban does not disclose the method comprising copying the active physical area into a buffer area, erasing all physical areas and copying the buffer into a first area available.

Mennecart discloses method comprising copying the active physical area into a buffer area *(buffer, abstract; step F5, temporary storage, FIG. 4)*, erasing all physical areas *(steps F3 and F3', FIG. 4)* and copying the buffer into a first area available *(page 5, line 1 – page 6, line 22; step F7, FIG. 4)*.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to copy the active physical area into a buffer area, erase all physical areas and copy the buffer into a first area available in the system of Ban, because Mennecart teaches the method to process a write command in memory such as EEPROM, a type of flash memory in smart cards, which reduces the time required for processing *(page 3, lines 9-35; abstract)*.

7.   **Claims 5 and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter "Ban")** as applied to claim **claims 2 and 23** above, and further in view of **Hazen et al. (WO 99/35650 hereinafter "Hazen").**

Consider **claims 5 and 26**, and as applied to **claims 2 and 23** above, Ban discloses the method comprising performing an erasure as described in claims 2 and 23.

However, Ban does not disclose the method comprising the erasure and programming/read operations in parallel thereby not blocking the electronic module.

Hazen discloses a method comprising programming/read operations in parallel thereby not blocking an electronic module *("read-while-write operations," title; abstract; page 2, paragraph 4; pages 5-7).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use programming/read operations in parallel with erasure thereby blocking an electronic module in the system of Ban, because Hazen teaches simultaneous operations is desired and an advantage in a flash memory device in terms of time constraints *(page 2, paragraph 2 and page 3, paragraph 1).*

8.   **Claims 6 and 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter "Ban")** in view of **Hazen et al. (WO 99/35650 hereinafter "Hazen")** as applied to **claims 5 and 26** above, and in view of **Lipovski (US Patent # 5758148).**

Consider **claims 6 and 27**, and as applied to **claims 5 and 26** above, Ban in view of Hazen discloses the method wherein comprises performing the erasure and programming/read operations in parallel, having mirror memory area(s), one area being used for programming/reading while the other area is erased as described above in claims 5 and 26.

However, Ban does not disclose the method wherein comprises performing the erasure and programming/read operations in parallel **in a bi-bank memory**, said bi-bank memory corresponding to the mirror memory area each bank having mirror area(s), one bank being used for programming/reading while the other bank is erased, **changing active bank when all physical areas of the bank used for programming/read have been used.**

Hazen discloses the method wherein comprises performing the erasure and programming/read operations in parallel *(one device may be written to, while the other device is being erased, page 2, paragraph 3)* in a bi-bank memory *(multiple flash memory devices, page 2, paragraph 3)*, said bi-bank memory corresponding to the mirror memory area *(Ban teaches mirror memory areas in memory, while Hazen teaches bi-bank memory as a type of memory)* each bank having physical area(s) *(as described in claims 5 and 26)*, one bank being used for programming/reading while the other bank is erased *(one device may be written to, while the other device is being erased, page 2, paragraph 3).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use programming/read operations in parallel in a bi-bank memory in the system of Ban, because Hazen teaches simultaneous operations is desired and an advantage in a flash memory device in term of time constraints *(page 2, paragraph 2; and page 3, paragraph 1).*

Lipovski discloses a method of changing an active bank when all physical areas of the bank used for programming/read have been used *(one memory*

bank reaches its capacity, the system switches to the other bank to permit data

writes, column 11, lines 38-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to change the active bank when all areas

of the active bank have been used for programming operations in the system of

Ban, because Lipovski teaches this allows to continue writing to memory without

erasing the full memory bank *(column 11, lines 38-42).*

9.   **Claims 9-10 and 30-31** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter "Ban")** as applied to **claims 1-2 and 13** above,

and further in view of **Kuo (US Patent # 4763305 hereinafter "Kuo").**

Consider **claims 9 and 30**, and as applied to **claims 1 and 13** above, Ban

discloses wherein the write is carried out as claims 1 and 13 above.

However, Ban does not disclose the method, wherein if the content of the

logical area is identical to the content of the active physical area or when said

write involves no erasure, the write is carried out in an active physical area, and

in a blank physical area otherwise.

Kuo discloses a method, wherein if the content of the logical area is

identical to the content of the active physical area, a write is carried out in an

active physical area *(if data in the area is the same as the data to be written, then*

avoid the erase/program cycle the data and the write is complete for that area,

column 6, lines 18-26), and in a blank physical area otherwise *(if old data in byte*

or block is already in erased state or blank, or the data does not match so the

physical area is erased or blank and then the write is performed; column 5, lines

62-68 and column 6, lines 18-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to include when the write is carried out in

an active physical area if the content of the logical area is identical to the content

of the active physical area or when said write involves no erasure, and in a blank

physical area otherwise, in the system of Ban, because Kuo teaches this saves

the time normally required to perform the erase *(column 6, lines 29-30).*

Consider **claims 10 and 31**, and as applied to **claims 9 and 30** above,

Ban discloses the method comprising programming *(writing)* of the logical area in

the blank physical area in claim 1 and 13.

However, Ban does not disclose the method comprising programming only

a portion of the logical area in the blank physical area.

Kuo discloses a method comprising programming only part of the logical

area in the blank physical area *(only erase/program those areas which need to*

be, those areas that new data is same as old do not need to be erased and

subsequently reprogrammed, column 5, lines 62-68 and column 6, lines 18-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to be able to program only part of the

logical area in the blank physical area in the system of Ban, because Kuo

teaches this saves the time normally required to perform the erase *(column 6,*

lines 29-30).

10.   **Claim 12, 36, and 37** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter "Ban")** and further in view of **Robinson et al. (US**

Patent # 5375222).

Consider **claim 12**, Ban discloses an electronic module having information

processing means *(the device writes and stores data, abstract)* and a flash type

non volatile memory *(flash memory, abstract)* having a mirror memory formed

from at least two physical areas *(flash memory physical address locations, page*

2, line 21) designed to contain a same logical area *(fixed-length group of physical*

byte addresses form a logical block, page 3, lines 1-2; one or more physically

contiguous flash memory areas or zones comprise a number of blocks, page 3,

lines 4-7; therefore the physical byte addresses are associated with logical

blocks, zones and units, FIG. 2, 3, & 7; Furthermore, there are a plurality of

unique Logical areas associated with a fixed-length group of physical byte

addresses: FIG. 3, 4, 7 and page 2, line 21-page 3, line 15), each new

programming operation to said logical area taking place in one of the physical

areas of the mirror memory *(flash memory system which "allows data to be*

continuously written to unwritten physical address locations," abstract; data

cannot be written to an area of flash memory in which data has previously been

written, unless the area is first erased, so the area is blank when programming

page 1, lines 26-29) (page 7, lines 1 - page 9, line 22 and page 13, claim 1).

However, Ban does not disclose the flash memory module being on a

card.

Robinson discloses a card comprising an electronic module having

information process means and a flash type non volatile memory *(abstract; title).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to use a card in the system of Ban,

because Robinson teaches it as a way of encasing flash memory and logic

circuitry to perform operations of storing and outputting data *(abstract).*

Consider **claim 36**, and as applied to **claim 12** above, Ban in view of

Robinson discloses the method wherein each physical area has a status which is

one of three statuses *(Ban: each block denotes its status: page 7, lines 11-14;*

each block maps to physical address, therefore each physical area has a status:

FIG. 4): blank *(Ban: block free and writable: page 7, line 13)*, active *(Ban: block*

allocates and contains user data: page 7, line 13-14) and used *(Ban: block*

deleted and not writable: page 7, line 13).

Consider **claim 37**, and as applied to **claim 36** above, Ban in view of

Robinson discloses the method wherein:

the blank status corresponds to one of the physical areas ready to receive

data but not selected for receiving data *(Ban: block free and writable: page*

7, line 13),

the active status corresponds to one of the physical areas ready to receive

data and selected for receiving data or to one of the physical areas

containing the actual content of the logical area to be read *(Ban: block*

allocates and contains user data: page 7, line 13),

the used status corresponds to one of the physical areas containing

an outdated data that shall not be read, said physical area waiting for an

erasure *(Ban: block deleted and not writable: page 7, line 13)*.

11.   **Claims 14-17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter "Ban") in view of **Hazen et al. (WO 99/35650**

hereinafter "Hazen") as applied to **claims 5 and 6** above, and further in view of **Assar**

et al. (WO 95/10083 hereinafter "Assar").

Consider **claims 14 and 15**, and as applied to **claims 5 and 6** above, Ban

in view of Hazen discloses the method comprising designating said active

physical areas *(active unit made up of active blocks, FIG. 7; page 9, lines 27-30;*

page 10, line 1).

However, Ban in view of Hazen does not disclose the method comprising

designating said active physical areas using a counter and incrementing the

counter on each change of active area.

Assar discloses a method comprising designating active physical areas using a counter *(counter 620 page 18, lines26-page 19, line 1; page 20, line 17 and 26; counter 620 is used in conjunction with flags such as the used/free flag 112* and incrementing the counter on each change of active area *(page 20, lines 10-19).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to designate active physical areas using a counter in the system of Ban in view of Hazen, because Assar teaches a counter is used to show the number of times a block has been erased and written (which areas are most and least worn out) in order to determine where to write next *(page 18, lines 26-28; abstract).*

Consider **claims 16 and 17**, and as applied to **claims 5 and 6** above, Ban in view of Hazen discloses the method of claims 5 and 6.

However, Ban in view of Hazen does not disclose the method comprising associating at least one bit with a logical area to represent the use state of at least one physical area of said logical area.

Assar discloses a method comprising associating at least one bit *(one bit used flag 626, page 18, line 36)* with a logical area *(data block, page 18, lines 31-37)* to represent the use state of at least one physical area of said logical area *(page 18, lines 35-37).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to associate at least one bit with a logical

area to represent the use state of at least one physical area of said logical area

in the system of Ban in view of Hazen, because Assar teaches used/free flag is

used to avoid an erase-before-write cycle and therefore avoid the overhead of an

erase cycle *(page 7, lines 9-21)*.

12.   **Claims 19-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ban (WO 94/20906 hereinafter "Ban") in view of **Hazen et al. (WO 99/35650**

hereinafter "Hazen") as applied to **claims 5 and 6** above, and further in view of **Kuo**

(US Patent # 4763305 hereinafter "Kuo").

Consider **claims 19 and 20**, and as applied to **claims 5 and 6** above, Ban

in view of Hazen discloses wherein the write is carried out as claims 5 and 6

above.

However, Ban in view of Hazen does not disclose the method, wherein if

the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical

area or when said write involves no erasure, the write is carried out in an active

physical area, and in a blank physical area otherwise.

Kuo discloses a method, wherein a write is carried out in an active

physical area if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the

active physical area *(if data in the area is the same as the data to be written, then*

avoid the erase/program cycle the data and the write is complete for that area,

column 6, lines 18-26), and in a blank physical area otherwise *(if old data in byte*

or block is already in erased state or blank, or the data does not match so the

physical area is erased or blank and then the write is performed; column 5, lines

62-68 and column 6, lines 18-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to include when the write is carried out in

an active physical area if the content of the logical area is identical to the content

of the active physical area or when said write involves no erasure, and in a blank

physical area otherwise, in the system of Ban in view of Hazen, because Kuo

teaches this saves the time normally required to perform the erase *(column 6,*

lines 29-30).

13.   **Claim 21-22** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ban**

(WO 94/20906 hereinafter "Ban") in view of **Assar et al. (WO 95/10083 hereinafter**

"Assar") as applied to **claim 7** above, and further in view of **Kuo (US Patent #**

4763305 hereinafter "Kuo").

Consider **claim 21**, and as applied to **claim 7** above, Ban in view of Assar

discloses wherein the write is carried out as claim 7 above.

However, Ban in view of Assar does not disclose the method, wherein if

the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the active physical

area or when said write involves no erasure, the write is carried out in an active

physical area, and in a blank physical area otherwise.

Kuo discloses a method, wherein a write is carried out in an active

physical area if the content of the logical area is identical to the content of the

active physical area *(if data in the area is the same as the data to be written, then*

avoid the erase/program cycle the data and the write is complete for that area,

column 6, lines 18-26), and in a blank physical area otherwise *(if old data in byte*

or block is already in erased state or blank, or the data does not match so the

physical area is erased or blank and then the write is performed; column 5, lines

62-68 and column 6, lines 18-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to include when the write is carried out in

an active physical area if the content of the logical area is identical to the content

of the active physical area or when said write involves no erasure, and in a blank

physical area otherwise, in the system of Ban in view of Assar, because Kuo

teaches this saves the time normally required to perform the erase *(column 6,*

lines 29-30).

Consider **claim 22**, and as applied to **claim 21** above, Ban in view of

Hazen and Kuo discloses the method comprising programming *(writing)* of the

logical area in the blank physical area in claim 1.

However, Ban in view of Hazen does not disclose the method comprising

programming only a portion of the logical area in the blank physical area.

Kuo discloses a method comprising programming only a portion of the

logical area in the blank physical area *(only erase/program those areas which*

need to be, those areas that new data is same as old do not need to be erased

and subsequently reprogrammed, column 5, lines 62-68 and column 6, lines 18-

30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to be able to program only a portion of the

logical area in the blank physical area in the system of Ban in view of Hazen,

because Kuo teaches this saves the time normally required to perform the erase

(column 6, lines 29-30).

Response to Arguments

14.   Applicant's arguments filed 02/26/2008 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. See above rejections and further explanation below.

Claim Objections

15.   Examiner removed previously made claim objections.

Claim Rejection 35 USC 112, first and second paragraph

16.   Examiner removed rejections previously made under 35 USC § 112, first and

second paragraph.

35 USC 103

17.   Applicant argues claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Ban. Examiner

respectfully disagrees.

18.   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., "a stationary association of a group of physical areas to a same and unique logical

area" page 13, 2nd to last paragraph) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although

the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification

are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057

(Fed. Cir. 1993).

19.   Applicant arguments pertaining to claim language *("Ban never discloses or*

suggests "associating at least two physical areas of the said memory ... with a same

and unique logical area for storing a content."") which was removed is moot, due to the

fact that the claim language was removed and altered. See above rejections and further

explanations.

20.   Applicant argues that "there is a one-to-one mapping in Ban between logical

units and physical units" and "Nowhere does Ban say anything to the contrary."

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Ban states, "Here it should be noted, the virtual

address space is not necessarily the same size as the physical address space *(page 2,*

lines 26-28)." Furthermore, it can be reasonably interpreted that the physical units can

be the physical byte addresses from the physical block, and the logical/virtual block

corresponds to 512 byte physical block *(address which denotes a 512 byte range, ie.*

beginning address + offset = physical block address) or 512 single physical byte

addresses *(page 3, line 1-29)*. And the zones and logical units *(FIG. 2, 3, 4, & 7)* can be

reasonably interpreted to be logical areas, which are made up of a plurality of blocks

and physical areas.

21.   Furthermore, one logical block address may correspond to one physical block

address, however as taught by Ban, one block is a group of physical byte addresses

(therefore, one logical block address to many physical byte addresses: page 2, line 21,

and page 3, lines 1-7; or one zone or unit to many physical block addresses, physical

byte addresses, etc...).

22.   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., "a fixed association between the at least two physical areas and the logical area..."

page 15) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in

light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

23.   Examiner agrees with Applicant that one could read logical area and physical

area broadly to cover different divisions of memory.

24.   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., "there would be a bit-for-bit mapping between the two...bit-for-bit mirroring" page

15) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light

of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See

In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

25.   Claims 11, 12, and 13 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. See

above rejections and explanations.

26.   Applicant argues the dependent claims are allowable for the same reasons as

the independent claims from which they depend. Examiner respectfully disagrees. See

above rejections and explanation.

Conclusion

27.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MATTHEW R. CHRZANOWSKI whose telephone

number is (571)270-1176. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on 571-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matt Kim/   Matthew R Chrzanowski
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2186   Examiner
                                                        Art Unit 2186

/M. R. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2186
7/10/2008